

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendments and Remarks filed on 07/30/09.

2. Claims 1-9, 12-26, and 28-45 are pending. Claims 1, 28, 29 and 45 are independent claims.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The Specification does not provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed "computer readable medium".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2176

5. Claims 1-9, 12-26, and 28-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, Applicant has amended claims to state that the indicia indicating the numerical tabular delta data that has been added to and deleted from the second document is displayed in substantial horizontal alignment. Applicant points to figure 5 as supporting this feature; however, it appears the drawings and specification does not support displaying the **numerical tabular delta data** with such indicia. While figure 5 depicts providing text delta data that has been added, substituted, or deleted from the second document relative to the first document, figure 5 does not support a similar feature for **numerical tabular delta data**. It appears Applicant is combining different embodiments of his invention to arrive at the instant claim. Figure 9, for example, is the only figure that depicts changes in both text data and tabular numerical data; however, figure 9 does not depict the indicia is in substantial horizontal alignment. Correction and/or clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-2, 9, 12-23, 25-26, and 28-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay, US 6,792,145 B2, 09/14/04 (filed on 06/08/01) in view of Zilberman, US 2006/0167772 A1, 07/27/06 (filed 10/30/02, provisional application filed on 10/30/02) and Ball et al., US 5,860,071, 01/12/99.

Regarding claim 1, Gay teaches a pattern recognition process for text document interpretation. Gay teaches extracting textual and tabular data from financial documents. A comparison is made between the character strings of the financial document and the character strings provided in the previous financial documents which meets the preamble, ***a system for generating a comparison of related subject matter found in two different financial documents***. See abstract.

Gay teaches his invention is directed to SEC documents such as 10-Q or 10-K financial documents which contain character strings and numerical data in tabular form. See column 1, lines 35-45 and column 2, lines 15-52. Comparisons are made between a raw SEC document containing tabular information that has been downloaded from a website and a new SEC financial document which also contains tabular information. See column 3, lines 35-67 and column 4, lines 1-38.

Gay teaches receiving the first and second document via a website wherein the documents are SEC documents such as 10-Q or 10-K financial documents which contain character strings and numerical data in tabular form which meets the limitation, ***a computer comprising a processor for receiving data corresponding to a first document comprising first document tabular numerical data and for further receiving data corresponding to a second document comprising second document tabular numerical data.*** See column 1, lines 35-45 and column 2, lines 15-52 and column 3, lines 35-67 and column 4, lines 1-38.

Gay further teaches extracting a first valid character string from a previously existing financial document and comparing each string in a first/old document to the character strings in the new/second financial document wherein each character string represents a numerical value that is stored in a database which meets the limitation, ***said processor for comparing said first-document tabular numerical data to related second-document tabular numerical data.*** See figure 1, column 2, lines 15-30, column 4, lines 14-67, and column 5, lines 1-40.

Gay teaches the comparison of the two documents results in the creation of a second matrix of character strings representing numerical data provided on a second plane in the database including those textual strings that are not included in the first matrix of textual strings (from the first document). See columns 5, lines 40-67 and column 6, lines 1-54.

EXAMINER NOTE: Determining which textual strings are new or not included in the first matrix of textual strings representing the first document and forming a second

Art Unit: 2176

matrix is generating tabular delta data indicative of a “change” because it is identifying a new textual string in the second financial document which is considered a “change”.

Gay teaches the first and second document tabular data contains text data and the comparator generates the text/tabular delta data which meets the limitations, ***said first document further comprising first-document tabular text data and said second document further comprising second-document tabular text data; wherein said processor further compares said first-document tabular text data to related second-document tabular text data to generate text tabular delta data.***

See figure 1, column 2, lines 1-15 and 24-52, column 3, lines 35-66, column 4, and column 9, lines 59-62. See also figure 5.

Gay does not teach:

generating numerical tabular delta data indicative of at least one of a difference and a percentage change between the related first-document tabular numerical data and said second-document tabular numerical data; the numerical tabular delta data is numerically different in amount from the related first-document tabular numerical data and second-document tabular numerical data

-or-

providing as output a modified version of said second-document having substantially the same arrangement of tabular text data and tabular numerical data as said second document; said modified version including indicia indicating a) said numerical tabular delta data that has been added to and deleted from said second-document relative to said first document and b) said text tabular delta

data that has been added to and deleted from said second document relative to said first document.

However, Zilberman discloses interpreting financial documents in which financial inputs are evaluated against a predetermined value and the results of the evaluation including changes and percentage changes are produced which meets the limitation, ***the numerical tabular delta data is numerically different in amount from the related first-document tabular numerical data and second-document tabular numerical data.*** For example, a variable may represent a difference in percent of total assets or percent of sales between one entity and its competitor. See page 4, paragraph [0059] and page 6, paragraph [0068]. Zilberman's teachings of a percentage change between tabular numerical data meets the limitation, ***generating numerical tabular delta data indicative of at least one of a difference and a percentage change between the related first-document tabular numerical data and said second-document tabular numerical data.*** See page 4, paragraph [0059] and page 6, paragraph [0068]. Zilberman further teaches modifying the second document having tabular data to include delta data such as percentage changes between one financial document and another which meets the limitation, ***providing as output a modified version of said second-document having substantially the same arrangement of tabular text data and tabular numerical data as said second document.*** See appendix D and E which show a "percentage change" and similar tabular text and numerical data as other financial documents.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Zilberman's depicting the change between financial information in the system of Gay because it provides for comparisons of financial information with previous periods, industry averages, etc in order to provide useful information and financial advice to a company or user to aid in their financial objectives. See page 1, paragraphs [0001]-[0005].

While Gay discloses first and second document tabular data contains text data and the comparator generates the text/**numerical tabular delta data** (see figure 1, column 2, lines 1-15 and 24-52, column 3, lines 35-66, column 4, and column 9, lines 59-62. See also figure 5); Gay does not disclose ***indicia in substantial horizontal alignment with and respectively corresponding to and indicating a) said numerical tabular delta data that has been added to and deleted from said second-document relative to said first document and b) said text tabular delta data that has been added to and deleted from said second document relative to said first document.***

Ball discloses ***indicia in substantial horizontal alignment with and respectively corresponding to and indicating substantially each occurrence of said text delta data that has been added to, substituted in, and deleted from said second-document relative to said first-document.*** See figure 2A and column 2, lines 14-37 which depicts what changes have been made to the pages and allows a user to view the changes such as the addition, substitution, and deletions to text in "substantial horizontal alignment".

Gay/Zilberman disclose displaying **numerical tabular delta data** as outlined above, but do not disclose providing *the indicia in substantial horizontal alignment indicating additions and deletions* to numerical tabular delta data. However, since it was known in the art to indicate text delta data and numerical tabular delta data (as taught by Gay/Zilberman) within a document, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have implemented Ball's indicia indicating data that has been added to or deleted from the second document to include the numerical delta data of Gay/Zilberman because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to combine these elements by known methods and the combination yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, extending Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of the numerical tabular data of Gay and Zilberman helped achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document thus enabling a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes. Thus the combination of Gay, Zilberman, and Ball teaches ***indicating in substantial horizontal alignment said numerical tabular delta data that has been added to and deleted from said second-document relative to said first document.***

Regarding claim 2, Gay does not teach displaying a modified version of a second-document; Zilberman further teaches modifying the second document having tabular data to include delta data such as percentage changes between one financial

Art Unit: 2176

document and another which meets the limitation, ***a user interface in communication with said processor for displaying said modified version of said second-document.*** See appendix D and E which show a “percentage change” and similar tabular text and numerical data as other financial documents.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Zilberman’s depicting the change between financial information in the system of Gay because it provides for comparisons of financial information with previous periods, industry averages, etc in order to provide useful information and financial advice to a company or user to aid in their financial objectives. See page 1, paragraphs [0001]-[0005].

Regarding claim 28, claim 28 is drawn to a system with substantially the same components claimed in claim 1, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale used in claim 1 above. Additionally, claim 28 recites the feature ***an output device for outputting the numerical tabular delta data and text delta data from the processor.*** Gay discloses outputting numerical tabular delta data and text delta data from a processor in column 1, lines 35-45 and column 2, lines 15-52 and column 3, lines 35-67 and column 4, lines 1-38.

Regarding claim 29, claim 29 is drawn to a method for the apparatus claimed in claim 1, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale used in claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 45, claim 45 is drawn to the computer program product comprising instructions for performing the comparison of the system claimed in claim 1, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale used in claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 9, Gay teaches comparing character strings associated with the numerical data provided in the previous financial document with the character strings in the second financial document which meets the limitation ***compare sections of the first document tabular numerical data with related subject matter sections of said second document tabular numerical data based on tables***. See figure 1, column 4, lines 14-67 and column 5, lines 1-40.

Regarding claim 12, Gay does not teach displaying one of said added data and substitution data. Ball discloses displaying added data and substitutions data. See figure 2A and column 2, lines 14-37 which depicts what changes have been made to the pages and allows a user to view the changes such as the addition, substitution, and deletions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extend Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of numerical data to achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document. Moreover, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Ball's indication of text tabular delta data to the graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it

Art Unit: 2176

enables a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. Furthermore, it was desirable at the time of the invention to highlight differences between documents. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have substituted Ball's method of indicating of delta data within Gay's system for indicating delta data to achieve the predictable result of displaying delta data.

Regarding claim 13, Gay does not teach the additions, deletions, and substitutions data are visually distinct from the tabular data; however, Ball discloses ***additions, deletions, and substitutions data are visually distinct from the tabular data***. See figure 2A and column 2, lines 14-37 which depicts what changes have been made to the pages and allows a user to view the changes such as the addition, substitution, and deletions represented by strike throughs, bold print, replacement indicators.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extend Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of numerical data to achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document. Moreover, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Ball's indication of text tabular delta data to the graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document.

Art Unit: 2176

Furthermore, it was desirable at the time of the invention to highlight differences between documents. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have substituted Ball's method of indicating of delta data within Gay's system for indicating delta data to achieve the predictable result of displaying delta data.

Regarding claim 14, Gay does not teach the additions, deletions, and substitutions data are displayed in a first, second, and third manner respectively; however, Ball discloses ***additions, deletions, and substitutions data are displayed in a third, fourth, and fifth manner respectively***. See figure 2A and column 2, lines 14-37 which depicts what changes have been made to the pages and allows a user to view the changes such as the addition (bold text), substitution (strikethrough and bold text), and deletions (strikethroughs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extend Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of numerical data to achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document. Moreover, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Ball's indication of text tabular delta data to the graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. Furthermore, it was desirable at the time of the invention to highlight differences

Art Unit: 2176

between documents. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have substituted Ball's method of indicating of delta data within Gay's system for indicating delta data to achieve the predictable result of displaying delta data.

Regarding claim 15, Gay does not teach indicia corresponding to delta data being one of numeric, alphabetic, alphanumeric, and consecutive sequence units. Ball discloses ***indicia comprises at least one of numeric, alphabetic, alphanumeric, and consecutive sequence units***. See figure 2A and column 2, lines 14-37 which depicts what changes have been made to the pages and allows a user to view the changes such as the addition, substitution, and deletions to text (i.e. alphabetic). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extend Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of numerical tabular data to achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Ball's indication of text tabular delta data to the graphical user interface in substantial horizontal alignment in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. Furthermore, it was desirable at the time of the invention to highlight differences between documents. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes. Moreover, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2176

a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have substituted Ball's method of indicating of delta data within Gay's system for indicating delta data to achieve the predictable result of displaying delta data.

Regarding claim 16, Gay teaches comparing character strings associated with numerical data provided in the previous financial document with the character strings in the second financial document which meets the limitation ***compare sections of the first document tabular text and tabular numerical data with related subject matter sections of said second document tabular text and tabular numerical data based on at least one of tables, graphs, columns, rows, time units, idea units and line items***. See figure 1, column 4, lines 14-67 and column 5, lines 1-40. Examiner Note: Line items are being interpreted as the character strings.

Regarding claim 17, Gay does not teach integrated at least two of the tabular delta data, text/tabular delta data, tabular data, and text/tabular data for delivery on a user interface. Ball discloses integrating tabular text data and text delta data for display on a user interface. See figure 2A and column 2, lines 14-37 which depicts what changes have been made to the pages and allows a user to view the changes such as the addition (bold text), substitution (strikethrough and bold text), and deletions (strikethroughs) compared to the original text data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extend Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of numerical data to achieve the

Art Unit: 2176

predictable result of highlighting changes in a document. Moreover, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Ball's indication of text tabular delta data to the graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. Furthermore, it was desirable at the time of the invention to highlight differences between documents. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have substituted Ball's method of indicating of delta data within Gay's system for indicating delta data to achieve the predictable result of displaying delta data.

Regarding claim 18, Gay teaches the first and second documents comprise data in a text format. See columns 1-2. Gay further teaches these documents include one or more lines of textual material and one or more columns of data associated with each line of textual material. See column 1, lines 35-46. The textual strings are separated into a separate column from the columns of numerical data. Before comparing the first document to the second document, a first valid character string is extracted from the old/original document. See column 4, lines 14-38.

Regarding claim 19, Gay further teaches extracting a first valid character string from a previously existing financial document and comparing each string in a first/old

Art Unit: 2176

document to the character strings in the new/second financial document. See figure 1, column 4, lines 14-67 and column 5, lines 1-40. Gay teaches the comparison of the two documents results in the creation of a second matrix of character strings provided on a second plane in the database including those textual strings that are not included in the first matrix of textual strings (from the first document) which meets the limitation ***generate text delta data***. See columns 5, lines 40-67 and column 6, lines 1-54.

Regarding claim 20, Gay teaches the delta data can include ***data that has been added*** in the new financial document. See column 2, lines 1-15 and column 9, lines 59-62. Gay does not teach the text delta data includes deletions data. Ball discloses ***text delta data includes deletions data***. See figure 2A and column 2, lines 14-37 which depicts what changes have been made to the pages and allows a user to view the changes such as the addition, substitution, and deletions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extend Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of numerical data to achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document. Moreover, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Ball's indication of text tabular delta data to the graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. Furthermore, it was desirable at the time of the invention to highlight differences between documents. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of

Art Unit: 2176

tracking changes. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have substituted Ball's method of indicating of delta data within Gay's system for indicating delta data to achieve the predictable result of displaying delta data.

Regarding claim 21, Gay teaches the delta data can *include data that has been added* in the new financial document. See column 2, lines 1-15 and column 9, lines 59-62. Gay does not teach the text delta data includes deletions data; however, Ball discloses *text delta data includes deletions data, and at least one of said added data and said substitutions data*. See figure 2A and column 2, lines 14-37 which depicts what changes have been made to the pages and allows a user to view the changes such as the addition, substitution, and deletions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extend Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of numerical data to achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document. Moreover, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Ball's indication of text tabular delta data to the graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. Furthermore, it was desirable at the time of the invention to highlight differences between documents. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2176

the art at the time of the invention to have substituted Ball's method of indicating of delta data within Gay's system for indicating delta data to achieve the predictable result of displaying delta data.

Regarding claim 22, Gay does not teach the additions, deletions, and substitutions data are visually distinct from the tabular data; however, Ball teaches displaying each of the additions, deletions, and substitutions data in a visually distinct manner as in figure 2A and column 2, lines 14-37 which meets the limitation, ***wherein said additions, deletions, and substitutions data is displayed on said user interface as visually distinct from said first document text data and said second document text data.***

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extend Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of numerical data to achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document. Moreover, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Ball's indication of text tabular delta data to the graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. Furthermore, it was desirable at the time of the invention to highlight differences between documents. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have substituted Ball's method of indicating of delta

Art Unit: 2176

data within Gay's system for indicating delta data to achieve the predictable result of displaying delta data.

Regarding claim 23, Gay does not teach the additions, deletions, and substitutions data are displayed in a first, second, and third manner respectively; however, Ball discloses additions are displayed in one manner, deletions in another manner, and substitutions in a third manner. See figure 2A and column 2, lines 14-37 which depicts what changes have been made to the pages and allows a user to view the changes such as the addition (bold text), substitution (strikethrough and bold text), and deletions (strikethroughs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to extend Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of **numerical tabular data** of Gay and Zilberman's system in order to achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes occurring in a document. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Ball's indication of text tabular delta data to the graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents, including numerical tabular data, in a database because it enables a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. Furthermore, it was desirable at the time of the invention to highlight differences between documents. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have

Art Unit: 2176

substituted Ball's method of indicating of delta data within Gay's system for indicating delta data to achieve the predictable result of displaying delta data.

Regarding claim 25, Gay teaches comparing character strings provided in the previous financial document with the character strings in the second financial document which meets the limitation ***compare sections of the first document text/tabular data with related subject matter sections of said second document text/tabular data based on at least one of tables, graphs, columns, rows, time units, idea units and line items***. See figure 1, column 4, lines 14-67 and column 5, lines 1-40. Examiner Note: Line items are being interpreted as the character strings.

Regarding claim 26, Gay does not teach integrated at least two of the tabular delta data, text/tabular delta data, tabular data, and text/tabular data for delivery on a user interface. Ball discloses integrating tabular text data and text delta data for display on a user interface. See figure 2A and column 2, lines 14-37 which depicts what changes have been made to the pages and allows a user to view the changes such as the addition (bold text), substitution (strikethrough and bold text), and deletions (strikethroughs) compared to the original text data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extend Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of numerical data to achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document. Moreover, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate

Art Unit: 2176

Ball's indication of text tabular delta data to the graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. Furthermore, it was desirable at the time of the invention to highlight differences between documents. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have substituted Ball's method of indicating of delta data within Gay's system for indicating delta data to achieve the predictable result of displaying delta data.

Regarding claim 30, Gay does not teach comparing sections of the first and second document based on graphs; however, Zilberman discloses interpreting financial documents in which financial inputs are evaluated against a predetermined value and the results of the evaluation including changes and percentage changes in the form are produced. See page 4, paragraph [0059] and page 6, paragraph [0068]. Zilberman's system includes graphics capabilities so that in addition to outputting text, graphs and charts can be output to illustrate the evaluated relationships such as the change and percentage change between previous periods. See page 6, paragraph [0068].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Zilberman's insertion of a graphic depicting the change between financial information in the system of Gay because it would visually display

Art Unit: 2176

comparisons of information with previous periods, industry averages, etc. See page 6, paragraph [0068].

Regarding claims 31 and 32, Gay teaches comparing items from the first document to those of second document based on columns and rows where a column includes data and the rows contain a data item. See columns 2-3.

Regarding claim 33, Gay teaches comparing items from a first document to a second document which can include time units. See columns 2-3.

Regarding claim 34, Gay teaches comparing items from a first document to a second document which can include idea units. See columns 2-3.

Regarding claim 35, Gay teaches comparing character strings in the first document with a second document. Line items are interpreted as character strings. See figure 1, column 4, lines 14-67 and column 5, lines 1-40.

Regarding claim 36, Gay does not teach the change is a mathematical difference amount; however, Zilberman discloses interpreting financial documents in which financial inputs are evaluated against a predetermined value and the results of the evaluation including changes and percentage changes in the form are produced. See page 4, paragraph [0059] and page 6, paragraph [0068]. Zilberman's system

Art Unit: 2176

includes graphics capabilities so that in addition to outputting text, graphs and charts can be output to illustrate the evaluated relationships such as the change and percentage change between previous periods. See page 6, paragraph [0068].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Zilberman's depicting the change between financial information in the system of Gay because it provides for comparisons of financial information with previous periods, industry averages, etc in order to provide useful information and financial advice to a company or user to aid in their financial objectives. See page 1, paragraphs [0001]-[0005].

Regarding claim 37, Gay does not teach the change is a mathematical difference amount comprises a subtraction amount; however, Zilberman discloses interpreting financial documents in which financial inputs are evaluated against a predetermined value and the results of the evaluation including changes and percentage changes in the form are produced. See page 4, paragraph [0059] and page 6, paragraph [0068]. Zilberman's system includes graphics capabilities so that in addition to outputting text, graphs and charts can be output to illustrate the evaluated relationships such as the change and percentage change between previous periods. See page 6, paragraph [0068].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Zilberman's depicting the change between financial information in the system of Gay because it provides for comparisons of financial

Art Unit: 2176

information with previous periods, industry averages, etc in order to provide useful information and financial advice to a company or user to aid in their financial objectives. See page 1, paragraphs [0001]-[0005].

Regarding claim 38, Gay does not teach the change is a percentage change; however, Zilberman discloses interpreting financial documents in which financial inputs are evaluated against a predetermined value and the results of the evaluation including changes and percentage changes in the form are produced. See page 4, paragraph [0059] and page 6, paragraph [0068]. Zilberman's system includes graphics capabilities so that in addition to outputting text, graphs and charts can be output to illustrate the evaluated relationships such as the change and percentage change between previous periods. See page 6, paragraph [0068].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Zilberman's depicting the change between financial information in the system of Gay because it provides for comparisons of financial information with previous periods, industry averages, etc in order to provide useful information and financial advice to a company or user to aid in their financial objectives. See page 1, paragraphs [0001]-[0005].

Regarding claim 39, Gay teaches the numerical data is financial metric data. See columns 1-2 and abstract.

Regarding claim 40, Gay teaches comparing two document which could be of the same financial institution. See abstract and columns 1-2.

Regarding claim 41, Gay teaches comparing two document which could be of the same financial institution or security. See abstract and columns 1-2.

Regarding claim 42, Gay does not teach displaying the sequence units in a substantial horizontal alignment; however, Ball teaches displaying the versions associated with deletions, additions, and substitutions in a horizontal alignment as in figure 2B which meets the limitations, ***said user interface displays the consecutive sequence units associated with the deleted data in substantial horizontal alignment***. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have implemented Ball's indicia indicating data that has been added to or deleted from the second document within Gay/Zilberman because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to combine these elements by known methods and the combination yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, extending Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of the numerical tabular data of Gay and Zilberman helped achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document thus enabling a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes.

Regarding claim 43, Gay does not teach displaying the sequence units in a substantial horizontal alignment; however, Ball teaches displaying the versions associated with deletions, additions, and substitutions in a horizontal alignment as in figure 2B which meets the limitations, ***said user interface displays the consecutive sequence units associated with the additions data in substantial horizontal alignment***. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have implemented Ball's indicia indicating data that has been added to or deleted from the second document within Gay/Zilberman because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to combine these elements by known methods and the combination yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, extending Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of the numerical tabular data of Gay and Zilberman helped achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document thus enabling a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes.

Regarding claim 44, Gay does not teach displaying the sequence units in a substantial horizontal alignment; however, Ball teaches displaying the versions associated with deletions, additions, and substitutions in a horizontal alignment as in figure 2B which meets the limitations, ***said user interface displays the consecutive sequence units associated with the substitutions data in substantial horizontal alignment***. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2176

time of the invention to have implemented Ball's indicia indicating data that has been added to or deleted from the second document within Gay/Zilberman because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to combine these elements by known methods and the combination yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, extending Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of the numerical tabular data of Gay and Zilberman helped achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document thus enabling a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes.

8. Claims 3-8 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay, US 6,792,145 B2, 09/14/04 (filed on 06/08/01) in view of Zilberman, US 2006/0167772 A1, 07/27/06 (filed 10/30/02, provisional application filed on 10/30/02) and Ball et al., US 5,860,071, 01/12/99, as applied to independent claims 1, 28, and 29 above, and further in view of Horton, US 2004/0230892 A1, 11/18/04 (filed 03/17/04, provisional application filed on 03/17/03).

Regarding claim 3, Gay/Zilberman/Ball do not teach the numerical tabular delta data is delivered on a user interface as visually distinct from the first-document tabular numerical data and said second-document numerical tabular data. However, Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed

Art Unit: 2176

simultaneously wherein the differences are highlighted in order to make it easy to find the differences which meets the limitation, ***wherein said tabular delta data is delivered on a user interface as visually distinct from the tabular data***. See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019] and figure 1. Highlighted the differences by italicizing certain words is providing a means to visually distinct the delta data from the tabular data.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

Regarding claim 4, Gay teaches the numerical tabular delta data indicates a difference between the first and second document tabular data. Gay does not teach it also displays a percentage change between the first document tabular numerical data and the second-document tabular numerical data, and wherein said visually distinct numerical tabular delta data for the difference change between the first document tabular numerical data and the second document tabular numerical data is represented in a first manner and the percentage change in a second manner.

However, Zilberman discloses interpreting financial documents in which financial inputs are evaluated against a predetermined value and the results of the evaluation including changes and percentage changes are produced which meets the limitation, ***displaying a percentage change***. For example, a variable may represent a difference in percent of total assets or percent of sales between one entity and its competitor. See page 4, paragraph [0059] and page 6, paragraph [0068]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Zilberman's depicting the change between financial information in the system of Gay because it provides for comparisons of financial information with previous periods, industry averages, etc in order to provide useful information and financial advice to a company or user to aid in their financial objectives. See page 1, paragraphs [0001]-[0005].

Furthermore, Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously wherein the differences are highlighted in order to make it easy to find the differences which meets the limitation, ***wherein said tabular delta data is delivered on a user interface as visually distinct from the tabular data in a first manner***. See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019] and figure 1. Highlighted the differences by italicizing certain words is providing a means to visually distinct the delta data from the tabular data.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the

Art Unit: 2176

differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document.

This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

Regarding claim 5, Gay does not teach displaying a plurality of visually distinct tabular delta data; however, Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously wherein the differences are highlighted in order to make it easy to find the differences which meets the limitation, ***a plurality of visually distinct numerical tabular delta data***. page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019] and figure 1. Figure 1 displays multiple drafts indicating a plurality of differences.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

Regarding claim 6, Gay does not teach indicia corresponding to delta data being one of numeric, alphabetic, alphanumeric, and consecutive sequence units. Ball discloses ***indicia comprises at least one of numeric, alphabetic, alphanumeric, and consecutive sequence units.*** See figure 2A and column 2, lines 14-37 which depicts what changes have been made to the pages and allows a user to view the changes such as the addition, substitution, and deletions to text (i.e. alphabetic). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extend Ball's depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of numerical tabular data to achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Ball's indication of text tabular delta data to the graphical user interface in substantial horizontal alignment in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. Furthermore, it was desirable at the time of the invention to highlight differences between documents. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have substituted Ball's method of indicating of delta data within Gay's system for indicating delta data to achieve the predictable result of displaying delta data.

Regarding claim 7, Gay does not teach inserting a graphic into the tabular delta data indicative of change magnitude for each change between related subject matter of

Art Unit: 2176

the first tabular data and the second document tabular data; however, Zilberman teaches an electronic interpretation of financials in which financial inputs related to an entity are evaluated against predetermined values. See abstract, page 1, paragraphs [0006]-[0011]. Zilberman's system includes graphics capabilities so that in addition to outputting text, graphs and charts can be output to illustrate the evaluated relationships such as the change and percentage change between previous periods which meets the limitation ***inserting a graphic into the tabular data indicative of change magnitude for each change between related subject matter of the first tabular data and the second document tabular data.*** See page 6, paragraph [0068].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Zilberman's insertion of a graphic depicting the change between financial information in the system of Gay because it would visually display comparisons of information with previous periods, industry averages, etc. See page 6, paragraph [0068].

Regarding claim 8, Gay does not teach the graphic is comprised of at least one of graphs, charts, statistics, and images. Zilberman's system includes graphics capabilities so that in addition to outputting text, graphs and charts can be output to illustrate the evaluated relationships. See page 6, paragraph [0068]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Zilberman's insertion of a graphic depicting the change between financial information in the system of Gay because it would visually display comparisons of

Art Unit: 2176

information with previous periods, industry averages, etc. See page 6, paragraph [0068].

Regarding claim 24, Gay does not teach that one of the additions, substitutions, or deletions data delivered on the user interface is chronicled by at least one of numeric, alphabetic, alphanumeric, and consecutive sequence units. However, Horton teaches delivering tabular delta data, indicative of changes made to the document, are chronicled by a draft number relating to the version of the document. See figure 1.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's chronicle in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to determine the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with versions of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed 07/30/09 have been fully considered.

The rejections under 35 USC 101 have been withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendments. New rejections under 35 USC 112 have been introduced in light of Applicant's amendments.

The objection to the Specification has been maintained because the "medium" has not been defined by the Specification. While the specification may mention "storage", it is not clear if the medium is limited to this embodiment since it has not been defined. Correction is required.

On pages 12-17, Applicant generally argues the combination of references fails to teach the claimed invention. On pages 12-13, Applicant argues Ball is concerned with "web repositories", not financial documents and thus is not combinable with the financial documents of Gay and Zilberman.

Examiner disagrees.

Ball is concerned with displaying changes made to a document. Regardless of whether the document is financial or not, Ball teaches that such features were known in the art at the time of the invention. A person of ordinary skill in the art would be able to implement such a feature in any type of document, including a financial document for the sake of depicting changes that have occurred in one version of a document and another version. Thus, Examiner believes the combination of Ball with Gay and Zilberman is appropriate because Ball's teachings could be implemented in any type of document including the financial documents of Gay and Zilberman.

Applicant argues the combination does not teach providing indicia for numerical tabular delta data.

Examiner disagrees.

Initially, it is noted that Applicant's specification does not appear to support the features that are claimed in the manner in which they are claimed. The specification

Art Unit: 2176

and drawings only support displaying in “substantial horizontal alignment” the text delta data. Figure 5 does not depict displaying indicia for “numerical **tabular** data” in substantial horizontal alignment. It appears Applicant is combining different embodiments of his invention to arrive at the instant claim. Figure 9, for example, is the only figure that depicts changes in both text data and tabular numerical data; however, figure 9 does not depict the indicia is in substantial horizontal alignment. Thus, rejections under 35 USC 112 have been presented above.

Gay/Zilberman disclose displaying **numerical tabular delta data** as outlined above, but do not disclose providing *the indicia in substantial horizontal alignment indicating additions and deletions* to numerical tabular delta data. However, since it was known in the art to indicate text delta data and numerical tabular delta data (as taught by Gay/Zilberman) within a document, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have implemented Ball’s indicia indicating data that has been added to or deleted from the second document to include the numerical delta data of Gay/Zilberman because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to combine these elements by known methods and the combination yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, extending Ball’s depiction of changes occurring in text data to that of the numerical tabular data of Gay and Zilberman helped achieve the predictable result of highlighting changes in a document thus enabling a user to view the differences between various versions of the same document. See column 2, lines 14-67 which discuss the advantages of tracking changes. Thus the combination of Gay, Zilberman, and Ball

Art Unit: 2176

teaches ***indicating in substantial horizontal alignment said numerical tabular delta data that has been added to and deleted from said second-document relative to said first document.*** Further, regardless of the type of data, Ball teaches that it was known to depict changes in data within a document as in figure 2. Whether this data is "text data" or "numerical tabular data", it was known to depict changes in **data** as also taught by Gay and Zilberman.

In view of the comments above, the rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2176

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RACHNA S. DESAI whose telephone number is (571)272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rachna S Desai/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176
10/29/09